

Appl. No. 10/035,319
Reply to Office action mailed 28 December 2004
Page 9

Regarding Sweeney, like Obel Sweeney entirely fails to mention or refer to "cord" (much less a "spinal cord" or spinal cord "stimulation"). Therefore, for the same reasons the other similarly defective rejections should be properly withdrawn, Applicants respectfully suggest that given the complete absence of the anatomy and approach specifically claimed in the pending claim set, the rejection grounded in Sweeney cannot stand and should be withdrawn.

Objections

Objections to the specification and drawings were raised and are herewith addressed (i.e., pages 1 and 16 amended and new FIG. 6F submitted) and thus said objections should be rendered moot.

Conclusion

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Hill et al. by their attorney

Date

Paul H. McDowall
Reg. No. 34,873
(763) 514-3351
Customer No. 27581

*Fig 6F
OK to
enter
Hillkey
8/31/05*